DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 064 429 UD 012 462

AUTHOR Nalven, Fredric; Hofmann, Louis J.
TITLE Final Report of the Evaluation of the 1969-1970 After School Study Centers Program: District Decentralized Project. ESEA Title I.
INSTITUTION Teaching and Learning Research Corp., New York, N.Y.
SPONS AGENCY New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, N.Y.
PUB DATE 70
NOTE 49p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *After School Centers; *After School Education; *After School Programs; After School Tutoring; Communication Skills; Compensatory Education Programs; Cultural Enrichment; Elementary School Students; *Program Evaluation; Remedial Mathematics; Remedial Reading
IDENTIFIERS *Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I; ESEA Title I; New York City

ABSTRACT

The prime objective of the After School Student Center (ASSC) programs, funded under Title I of the 1965 Elementary Secondary Education Act, is to provide afterschool remediation and enrichment to primary school children from public and nonpublic schools. During the 1969-70 school year, 44 such ASSC's functioned throughout the five boroughs of New York City. Most of the programs operated three days per week from three to five p.m. Attendance in all cases was on a voluntary basis and enrollment was on a first-come, first-served basis with referrals made by the regular classroom teachers with parental approval. The primary curricula of the ASSC's involved remedial reading, remedial mathematics, language arts, and communications skills, especially for non-English speaking children, and various Afro-Puerto Rican cultural programs in some centers. Some centers also offered library programs and a variety of dramatic, art, and music programs. The following procedures were used to evaluate the extent to which the program objectives were met: fifteen centers were visited and reported on. A total of 99 children were randomly sampled from these 15 centers for intensive study. The regular classroom teachers of the participating students as well as 47 ASSC staff members completed questionnaires concerning their impressions of how the centers were operating and made recommendations concerning their improvement. (Author/JM)

ED 064429

DISTRICT DECENTRALIZED PROJECT

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

FINAL REPORT OF THE EVALUATION OF THE

1969-1970

AFTER SCHOOL STUDY CENTERS PROGRAM

Evaluation of a New York City school district educational project funded under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (PL 89-10), performed under contract with the Board of Education of the City of New York for the 1969-70 school year.

UD 012462

TEACHING & LEARNING
RESEARCH CORP.

355 Lexington Avenue/New York, New York 10017/212-490-0197

AFTER SCHOOL STUDY CENTERS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
	Acknowledgements	ii
	List of Figures and Tables	iii
	Executive Summary	iv
I	The New York City After School Study Centers	1
	Proposed Objectives and Services	3
II	Evaluation Objectives and Procedures	4
	Interim Observations	4
	General Initial Impressions Reported in the Interim report	7
	The Final Evaluation: Samples and Procedures	8
III	Results	17
	Variables of the Study	22
	Treatment of Missing Observations	23
	Sample Statistics	24
	1968-1969 (Pre-center) Performance	25
	1969-1970 Performance (ASSC Program in effect)	26
	Correlates of 1970 Performance	28
	Attendance	29
	Drop-Outs	29
	English-as-a-Second Language Students	29
	Special Cases in the Sample	32
IV	Conclusions and Recommendations	38
	Major Conclusions	38
	Recommendations	40
	After School Study Centers - Evaluation Staff	42

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Teaching & Learning Research Corp. expresses its appreciation for assistance given in the evaluation of this project. First to the staff of the Bureau of Educational Research of the Board of Education of the City of New York - Former Assistant Superintendent, Dr. J. Wayne Wrightstone; Acting Director, Dr. Samuel D. McClelland; and Acting Assistant Director, Dr. George Forlano.

Second, to the Administrative Staff of the schools in which the project operated. And finally, with greatest appreciation, to the staff and participants of the After School Study Center program.

AFTER SCHOOL STUDY CENTERS

LIST OF FIGURES AND TABLES

		Page
Figure I	AFTER SCHOOL STUDY CENTERS Regular Teacher Interview Form	10 & 11
Figure II	AFTER SCHOOL STUDY CENTERS Staff and Administrator Interview Form	12 & 13
Figure III	AFTER SCHOOL STUDY CENTERS School Records Data Sheet I	15 & 16
Table 1	PRODUCT-MOMENT CORRELATIONS BETWEEN AFTER SCHOOL STUDY CENTER VARIABLES AND MISSING DATA VARIABLE	24
Table 2	MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF TEACHER EVALUATIONS	25
Table 3	MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF STANDARD GRADE EQUIVILENTS ON ARITHMETIC AND READING 1968-69	26
Table 4	MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND CHANGE IN TEACHER EVALUATIONS	26
Table 5	F VALUE (t^2) AND PROBABILITY LEVELS FOR CHANGES IN TEACHER EVALUATIONS	27
Table 7	F VALUES (t^2) AND PROBABILITY LEVELS FOR CHANGES IN STANDARD ACHIEVEMENT	28
Table 8	AVERAGE 1969-70 TEACHER EVALUATIONS FOR ENGLISH-AS-A-SECOND LANGUAGE STUDENTS	31
Table 9	FREQUENCY AND PROPORTIONS OF ENGLISH-AS-A-SECOND LANGUAGE STUDENTS ACHIEVING ABOVE, AT, OR BELOW GRADE LEVEL ON STANDARD ACHIEVEMENT TESTS	32

THE NEW YORK CITY AFTER SCHOOL STUDY CENTERS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The prime objective of the ASSC programs is to provide after-school remediation and enrichment to primary school children from public and nonpublic schools. New York City has operated such programs since 1964 under the auspices of ESEA Title I.

During the 1969-70 school year, 44 such ASSC's functioned throughout the five boroughs. Most of the programs operated three days per week from 3-5 PM. Attendance in all cases was on a voluntary basis and enrollment was on a first-come, first-served basis with referrals made by the regular classroom teachers with parental approval.

The primary curricula of the ASSC's involved remedial reading, remedial math, language arts and communication skills, especially for non-English speaking children, and various Afro-Puerto Rican cultural programs in some centers. Some centers also offered library programs and a variety of dramatic, art, and music programs.

Objectives and Methods of Evaluations

Seven centers were visited and reported on in our interim report. Fifteen ceners (from all five boroughs) were studied and reported on in our final evaluation report.

A total of 99 children were randomly sampled from these 15 centers. For all 99 cases, the child's ASSC teacher completed a questionnaire assessing his progress in the program. A similar assessment was made by 97 of these children's regular classroom teacher. In the case of 88 of these students, a statistical comparism was made between their 1968-1969 and their 1969-70 school records including attendance, lateness, report card grades, and standardized achievement test scores.

The students regular classroom teachers, as well as 47 ASSC staff members also completed questionnaires concerning their impressions of how the ASSC's were operating and made recommendations concerning their improvement.

Fundamental Interpretations

The majority of pupils were judged by both their regular classroom teacher as well as their ASSC teacher as having been helped substantially by their ASSC experiences. In their teachers' judgment, the children's improvements ranged widely and included all basic educational tool subjects and in their attitudes towards school and themselves as independent, worthwhile learners.

Both the ASSC and the regular teachers judged the ASSC programs to be very valuable. The major limitations and recommendations reported were (1) the children who need the program most often are not those who attend them; (2) smaller classes, homogenously grouped are needed for greater numbers of children. Consequently, ASSC staff size should be increased; (3) More stimulating materials and methods, especially those unavailable during the regular school day, should be employed in the ASSC's, and (4) More regular communication between ASSC staff and the regular teachers should be available so their activities can be coordinated.

Quantitative comparisons of the 1968-1969 vs. the 1969-70 school records of our sample of students had as its major positive finding a statistically significant improvement in the childrens' standardized test scores in reading and arithmetic. Report card grades reflected no such improvement.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The Teaching and Learning evaluation team shared the views of the regular classroom teachers and ASSC staff concerning the strengths and weaknesses of the programs, as mentioned above. That is, the programs should be continued, staff size should be increased so as to provide smaller, homogenously grouped, classes, innovative methods and materials should be provided, and procedures for ensuring more communication between ASSC staff and regular teachers should be provided for.

In addition, the Teaching and Learning evaluation team offered the following conclusions and recommendations:

Whereas it appears that the ASSC's have successfully completed their mission to the children they serve, they have apparently failed to reach large numbers of children who desparately need such help but have not availed themselves of it or who have been excluded because of their misbehavior, etc. Methods of recruiting

and maintaining this more unreachable enrollee needs to be employed. Among the types of maneuvers that might be employed to reach such children would be; (1) making their attendance mandatory; (2) providing material and social incentives for such children and their parents (3) offering special incentives to those ASSC teachers who are willing and able to maintain and help such children in their ASSC classes.

Chapter I

THE NEW YORK CITY AFTER SCHOOL STUDY CENTERS

Our children are growing up in a world of discomfortingly rapid change, painful and dangerous tensions among the generations, struggles among racial and ethnic groups, both nationally and internationally, emerging cognizance of problems threatening our existence and quality of life, and, perhaps most importantly, awareness that the old ways are no longer relevent to the solution of the new problems.

As in no other time or place, contemporary America turns to public education in the hope of shaping a future populace capable of surmounting its opportunities.

For, where but in the public schools do we have the chance of effectively making broad scale, face-to-face contact between the developing child and the professionally trained educator?

The New York City Board of Education, itself beset with these same problems, and with the aid of state and federal support, has attempted to utilize a wide array of programs designed to make the kinds of educational impact needed by today's youth. Great strides have been made to insure that the regular school day is filled with as much value as possible. Much more has to be done and assuredly will be, but the regular school day's resources can be stretched just so far and no further.

Adjunctive, supplementary, remedial, and enriching after-school programs are a natural outgrowth of our perceived needs and our realization that we can do just so much during the regular school day. The After School Study Centers of New York City represent one important program of this kind. During the 1969-1970 academic year, New York City operated 44 After School Study Centers for its elementary pupils in its five boroughs. The present study was undertaken in an attempt to evaluate the effectiveness of these Centers.

In this program, beginning in 1964, the school day was extended for many pupils by providing After-School Study Centers in which teachers taught small classes from 3:00 to 5:00 P.M. each day. The curriculum comprised chiefly of remedial reading and arithmetic, library training, and homework assistance. A variety of additional enrichment activities, including music, art, health education, and such ethnic curricula as Black and Puerto Rican culture, have also been involved in many Centers in recent years.

The initial 167 Centers were established in October 1964. The After School Study Center programs have been described, and evaluated (through the 1966-67 school year) in a report entitled, "It Works: After School Study Centers, New York City." This publication resulted from the evaluation of American Institutes for Research in the Behavioral Sciences, Palo Alto, California, under contract with the U. S. Office of Education. That report summarizes a variety of positive results produced by the After School Study Centers programs, especially in the area of reading.

Other, generally very favorable evaluation studies of the Centers have been reported (e.g. Lohman, Maurice A. The Expansion of the After School Study Centers for Disadvantaged Public and Nonpublic School Pupils (Center for Urban Education, New York, N.Y., Committee on Field Research and Evaluation, September 1967, and Bernstein, Bruce, N., The After School Study Centers for Disadvantaged Pupils (Center for Urban Education, August 1966).

PROPOSED OBJECTIVES AND SERVICES

Established under decentralized Title I-E.S.E.A, the After School Study Centers attempt to supplement and enrich regular daily instruction of basic educational skills. There are 44 After School Study Center programs among the school districts of New York City. While these individual centers vary in name, program specifics, and educational techniques, they are all designed to attain the stated objectives of the Title I - E.S.E.A. After School Study Centers which are as follows:

1) To improve achievement levels in reading and mathematics.

2) To give children an opportunity to make up for retardation that has existed so that they may be advanced in school placement in the curriculum areas.

3) To provide experiences that will help those children who need remediation to improve their self-image by by success in the program.

4) To develop independent study habits and work skills needed for success in all curriculum areas.

5) To individualize instruction in terms of pace and content.

6) To enhance satisfactory adjustment to the school situation.

7) To enable the regular teachers of these children to obtain information about their special needs.

8) To provide assistance in specialized secondary school subjects.

CHAPTER II

EVALUATION OBJECTIVES AND PROCEDURES

The objectives of this project evaluation were twofold:

1) To examine the degree to which After School Study Center Programs are functioning in accordance with stated procedures, and

2) To examine the degree to which the program enhances achievement levels, self-image, work skills, and school adjustment.

I. INTERIM OBSERVATIONS

The research team began to visit these centers in February of 1970 to make and record observations of the teaching-learning interactions occurring there, and to arrange for the quantitative data which was compiled and reported in this final evaluation report.

The interim report attempted to summarize the observations made and the impressions gained from the first visits made to seven centers in Brooklyn and the Bronx. These interim observations were by necessity, quite general and purposely focussed on only a small portion of the centers which were eventually sampled in the final evaluation report.

A. Locations -- All of the seven centers visited were housed in public schools.

B. Meeting Times -- The five centers in Brooklyn met two days per week (either Tuesday and Wednesday or Tuesday and Thursday) from 3-5PM, while the other met three days per week from 2:30-4:30. This latter center's atypical three day per week schedule resulted from the fact that , due to the great demand in that neighborhood, and the scarcity of resources, an attempt was made to spread the center's impact by offering two "split-shifts," with one group of children arriving at 2:30 and another at 3:30.

C. Classroom Groupings - - Each of the five Brooklyn centers visited, divided the children into classes with rosters of 25. Class placement seemed to be determined primarily on

the basis of reading level. One Bronx center divided its 85 enrolled children into five classes (two fourth grade and three third grade), while the other Bronx center, which had about 175 enrolled children on a two split-shift basis, ran its five classes (four remedial and one Afro-American culture) on a flexible basis with the children being free to attend whichever class they wished to.

D. Observed Attendance - - The actual number of children per class observed in attendance at the seven centers visited ranged from two to seventeen with a mean of 10 or 11.

E. Pupil Ethnicity--Approximately 85 percent of the children observed in the centers were either Black or Puerto Rican with White pupils comprised largely of Italian-American Catholic parochial school students.

F. Subject matter and Educational Materials--A wide variety of materials and approaches were observed. A sense of this diversity perhaps can best be conveyed by the following examples of research-observer verbatim notes based on our classroom visits:

1) Center K-1, Mr. D.-- "He showed me a list of materials... especially the Continental Press readymade rexographs....a phonics lesson is on the blackboard, e.g. 'short i' and 'long i', 'tim +e = time'. An alphabetizing assignment is also on the board."

2) Center K-1, Mr. F.--"His lesson consists of putting words with the same final consonant on the board (e.g. good, bad) and having the children listen to them and read them...He uses Phonics We Use, Book C, McCall Crabbs and Practice for Using Good English. He does very little math."

3) Center K-1, Mr. G.--"He divides subject matter: Tuesday--reading, Thursday--math and language arts. He uses the New Practice Reader, Uncle Ben, Know Your World, newspapers, and Continental Press rexographs. He reads stories for motivation to the class and gives regular vocabulary tests. The reading for comprehension is geared to the final test."

4) Center K-3, Miss I.--"She does not teach straight phonics of 'reading'. She believes that each lesson should be interesting and a surprise that learning should go on incidentally. Her lesson was on 'the calendar'. Each child was given a rexograph of a calendar and different calendars in the room were pointed out. The goal of the lesson was to become familiar with and be able to read the terms 'day', 'week', 'month', 'year', and know how many units are in each.

"The first 15 minutes of class are set aside for homework, the next 15 minutes are devoted to SRA work on listening skills...Sometimes she shows a film or used some other visual aid and has the children write a sentence or story afterward. She also uses games (lotto, missing word, sentence builder, etc.)".

G. TEACHING STYLE AND CLASSROOM ATMOSPHERE - - Teacher approached and educational atmosphere of the classes visited varied extremely. No brief description could adequately summarize the diversity. Here, too, it seems best to offer relevant excerpts of verbatim observational notes to illustrate the range of teaching-learning conditions our researchers have come upon:

"Mrs. B. is a vivacious 'youngish' teacher who has 10 years of experience with a regular third grade class...She is friendly, animated and relaxed, but maintains good discipline. She enunciates well and speaks loudly enough for everyone to hear and keep 'tuned in'. She asks motivating questions in a very interested, animated voice and adds funny questions if there is no response...The class was lively and the students seemed quite motivated to perform... It is obvious that the children are benefitting from her experience."

"Mrs. J. is an elderly, very professional teacher...She is animated and enthusiastic...but...seemed rather taken with herself and her abilities and gave the impression that it was just as well that the 'slower' or non-English children were not in her charge. With the 'brighter' children, however, she is extremely successful. The children were quiet and attentive at the tables."

"To help keep the children interested, Mr. A. gives them a cookie if they finish two of the SRA books in half an hour: when they have finished four, they are allowed to play with the phonics games. Mr. A. says the cookies have helped his control of the class.. Although this class was somewhat noisy, especially towards the end, when the children were playing games, it was orderly and the children were interested and enjoying themselves. Mr. A. has done a good job of motivating them."

"When visited near the end of the session, the class was engaged in drawing replicas of the Puerto Rican Flag, but had been listening to material about Booker T. Washington, about whom there was a written paragraph on the board for them to copy...in addition to the historic and cultural material presented, he also discussed frankly with the children, problems in their daily lives. Mr. N. seems very sincere and interested in making this class stimulating for the children.

D. ATTITUDE OF THE CHILDREN--In order to get a sense of how the children feel about attending the centers, the researchers made it a practise to briefly interview individually a small randomly selected sample of the students. The children interviewed appeared very favorably disposed toward the centers. Some illustrative excerpts from the researchers' notes follow:

"In answer to questioning, Jose says he attends the class because he likes to read, and because it 'saves time.' Questioned further, he said it saves time because 'you learn words you don't know and then you don't have trouble with them in class.' A good endorsement of the program!"

"Luis...has trouble with English and I couldn't understand him too well. He wants to 'learn reading'. His mother and teacher suggested he come to the center, and he says he likes it, although he seems afraid to say anything else and may not even understand me. Spanish is spoken in the home."

GENERAL INITIAL IMPRESSIONS REPORTED IN THE INTERIM REPORT

The centers visited appeared to be seriously conducted educational ventures which were designed primarily to extend the regular school curriculum's benefits to well-motivated (and/or family-pressured and/or teacher-prodded youngsters). Pupil selection procedures and the "voluntariness" of attendance may have unfortunately resulted in the centers' catering, not to those children who need them most, but rather to those children who are most easily "cajoled" into or who simply enjoy a longer school day.

Teacher enthusiasm, energy, creativity, and committment appeared to vary very widely, and since the success of the programs may well depend largely on such teacher variables, the question of teacher selection, supervision, and ongoing motivation need further careful scrutiny. Some teachers seemed

to approach their classes as part of an overly-long day's chore while others zestfully searched for interesting means of making the After School Study Center a truly unique, beneficial educational experience not available to children during the regular school day.

It was hoped that in our final evaluation we would be able to provide the objective quantitative data which would enable us to truly appreciate the impact of the centers and perhaps what aspects of the teaching-learning situation serve to maximize the program's effectiveness.

II. THE FINAL EVALUATION: SAMPLES AND PROCEDURES

A. The Pupil Sample: Ninety-nine children, (41 boys and 58 girls) were sampled. Their ages ranged from 6 to 14 and were distributed as follows:

AGES	NUMBER OF CASES
6	1
7	8
8	14
9	29
10	24
11	15
12	5
13	2
14	1
Total =	99

Their regular class grades ranged from 1 to 6 and were distributed as follows:

GRADES	NUMBER OF CASES
1	4
2	13
3	23
4	34
5	16
6	9
Total =	99

The children attended 15 different After School Study Centers in the five boroughs of New York City during the 1969-1970 school year. The number of children studied from each of the 15 After School Study Centers sampled was as follows:

AFTER SCHOOL STUDY CENTER	NUMBER OF CASES
29K	7
32K	4
261K	7
1M	8
42M	7
126M	9
19Q	10
143Q	5
39X	5
58X	7
60X	5
62X	5
100X	5
107X	5
16R	10
Total =	99

The children in the sample were drawn randomly from the rosters of New York City's 44 After School Study Centers, which were also randonly selected within each borough.

For each of the 99 children sampled, two rating scales were completed, one by their regular classroom teacher, and one by their After School Study Center teacher. In some cases, the same teachers served both roles. These two rating scales, which are reproduced below were obtained from the respondant by a member of our research staff in a fact to face interview, except for a very few instances in which the teacher mailed in the rating scale completed by himself.

Figure I

AFTER SCHOOL STUDY CENTERS
Regular Teacher Interview Form

Date_____

Name of Student _____

Age _____ Sex _____

Name of Teacher _____

School _____ Class _____

After School Study Center Child Attends _____

A. Information Received by Regular Teacher by ASSC	Yes	No
1. Have you received information concerning this child from the ASSC?	____	____
2. Has this information proved valuable?	____	____
3. Have you received any written reports from this child's ASSC teacher?	____	____
4. Have you had any other contacts with this child's ASSC teacher?	____	____
5. Has this child given you any information concerning his ASSC experience?	____	____
6. Have you received any information from this child's parents concerning his ASSC experiences?	____	____
7. Have you had enough feedback concerning this child's ASSC experiences?	____	____
8. Would you like to have had more of such information?	____	____

9. What kinds of information would you like to receive?
_____
_____

10. What do you think are the best features of the ASSC? _____
_____
_____

11. What do you think are the major limitations of the ASSC? _____
_____
_____

12. To what extent do students seek and receive assistance at the ASSC? Please elaborate. _____
_____
_____

13. What suggestions do you have for improving the ASSC? _____
_____
_____

B. Regular Teacher's Impressions Concerning The Results of This Child's ASSC Exerpience

	Yes	No
1. Has this child been helped significantly by his ASSC experience?	_____	_____
2. Has he been helped as much as you had expected?	_____	_____
3. Would you have liked him to have attended ASSC more often?	_____	_____
4. Has he been given the kind of help he needed most?	_____	_____
5. Has his ASSC experiences helped him to deal more effectively with the regular school day's work?	_____	_____
6. Has he progressed more this year than compariable students who did not attend ASSC?	_____	_____
7. Have you observed any negative effects resulting from this child's ASSC experiences?	_____	_____
8. Please describe what effects this child's ASSC experience have had on him._____		_____

_____

_____

Figure II

AFTER SCHOOL STUDY CENTERS
Staff and Administrator Inverview Form

Center_____ Date_____

Name of Staff Member_____
Position at Center
Number of Years Teaching Experience
Number of Years of ASSC Experience (Including this year)

A. General Interview

1. What do you think are the best features of your ASSC? _____

2. What do you think are the major limitations of your ASSC.?_____

3. To what extent do students seek and receive assistance at your ASSC.?_____

4. What suggestions do you have for improving the ASSC.?_____

5. What do you think of the procedures employed in selecting which children will attend the ASSC.? _____

6. What do you think about the attendance problems of the ASSC.?__

B. Specific ASSC Child's Progress Center_____

Name of Student_____
Age_____
Regular School_____ Class_____

	Yes	No
1. Has this child been helped significantly by his ASSC experiences?	_____	_____
2. Has he been helped as much as you had expected?	_____	_____
3. Would you have liked him to have attended the ASSC more often?	_____	_____
4. Has he been given the kind of help he needed most?	_____	_____
5. Have you observed any negative effects from his ASSC experiences?	_____	_____
6. Did you have enough information concerning his regular day classwork assignments, curricula, and materials?	_____	_____
7. Do you feel that the ASSC pace and content was fully suited to help him with his school learning problems?	_____	_____
8. Should this child attend an ASSC next year?	_____	_____
9. Has there been sufficient exchange of information between the ASSC staff and his regular teacher?	_____	_____

10. Please summarize what you believe to be the overall effects of this child's ASSC experiences this year?_____

_____

_____

_____

11. In what areas (be as specific as possible) do you feel this child still needs supplementary or remedial help?_____

_____

_____

_____

B. The ASSC Staff and Administrator Sample. Forty-seven ASSC staff and administrators were sampled. They described their roles as varied and were distributed as follows:

Role	No. of Cases
Teacher	5
Teacher of reading	12
Teacher of reading and mathematics	11
Teacher of mathematics	2
Corrective reading	2
Teacher for non-English speaking pupils	4
Teacher of Black & Puerto Rican studies	1
Library teacher	1
Teacher-in-charge	1
Supervisor	3
Assistant Principal-in-charge	1
Supervisor - Principal	3
Director	1
Total	47

C. The Rating Scales. The rating scales reproduced in Figures 1 and Figure 2 each contained two parts. One part referred to a particular child's observed progress and the other part dealt with the regular teacher's or ASSC staff member's assessment of the ASSC program in general. No regular teacher or ASSC staff member was asked to complete the section dealing with his assessment of the ASSC program more than once, whereas many did complete the specific child rating section for 2 or more different pupils.

D. School Records Data Sheet. For 88 of the 99 pupils selected in the sample, a School Records Data Sheet, reproduced in Figure 3, was completed. This information was obtained by a member of our research staff who visited the child's school and inspected his cumulative record folder. This information was not available for 11 of our 99 children. Various reasons accounted for this, including movement outside the district, missing records, lack of cooperation on the part of regular school staff, etc. This information was obtained during the last two weeks of the 1969-1970 school year.

Figure 3 AFTER SCHOOL STUDY CENTERS
School Records Data Sheet I

Name Column

Regular school ASSC Center

1. ID number: (1, 2, 3) _
(1

2. Birthdate: year (4,5)
month (6,7)

3. Sex: 1) Male 2) Female (8)

4. To which ASSC Program Center assigned: (9,10)
(List schools and code from 01...) :

5. School attending (List schools and code 01...) (11,12)

6. Current Grade Level: (13)

7. Number of days per week ASSC Program available: (14)

8. Number of times absent from ASSC: (15,16)

9. Number of days late in 68/69 (17,18)

10. Number of days late in 69/70: (19,20)

11. Number of days absent in 68/69: (21,22)

12. Number of days absent in 69/70: (23,24)

13. Grades for June 1969:

85 & Higher	=4	Social Behavior	(25)
75-84	=3	Work & Study Habits	(26)
65-74	=2	Reading	(27)
Less than 65	=1	Oral Expression	(28)
		Written Expression	(29)
		Spelling	(30)
		Handwriting	(31)
		Social Studies	(32)
		Math	(33)
		Science	(34)
		Health Education	(35)
		Music	(36)
		Art	(37)
		Home Economics	(38)

14. Grade for June 1970:

85 & Higher	=4	Social Behavior	(39)
75-84	=3	Work & Study Habits	(40)
65-74	=2	Reading	(41)
Less than 65	=1	Oral Expression	(42)
		Written Expression	(43)
		Spelling	(44)
		Handwriting	(45)
		Social Studies	(46)
		Math	(47)
		Science	(48)
		Health Education	(49)
		Music	(50)
		Art	(51)
		Home Economics	(52)

15. Is this student (53)

1) still in the program
2) dropped out of ASSC, but still in school
3) dropped out of school
4) transferred to another school
5) left school, but is not a "drop-out"

16. Standardized Achievement test scores for the most recent semester prior to entering the ASSC Program (From School records) and for this current semester.

TEST NAME	DATE	GRADE EQUIVALENT SCORES

CHAPTER III
RESULTS

A. The Pupils as Rated by their ASSC Teachers.

Each Child's ASSC teacher rated him with regard to the eleven items contained in the section referred to as "B". SPECIFIC ASSC CHILD'S PROGRESS" which is part of the Staff and Administrator Interview Form reproduced above in Figure 2.

Items 1-9 required only a YES or NO answer from the ASSC teacher. The results of the ratings on these items were as follows:

Item Number	Content	Number of the 99 Children Rated Yes or No by their ASSC Teacher	
		YES	NO
1.	Has he been helped significantly by his ASSC experiences?	76	23
2.	Has he been helped as much as you had expected?	70	29
3.	Would you have liked him to have attended the ASSC more often?	45	54
4.	Has he been given the kind of help he needed most?	91	8
5.	Have you observed any negative effects from his ASSC experiences?	3	96
6.	Did you have enough information concerning his regular day classwork, etc.	73	26
7.	Do you feel that the ASSC pace and content was fully suited to help him, etc.	89	10
8.	Should this child attend an ASSC next year?	86	13
9.	Has their been sufficient exchange of information between the ASSC Staff and his regular teacher?	68	31

These results clearly indicate that the ASSC teachers felt that the vast majority of our sample of children were helped significantly by their ASSC experiences. They believed that the children were given as much help as was expected, the kind of help they needed most, and that the pace and content of the ASSC programs were well suited to the Children's needs. In only 3 out of 99 cases were any negative effects on children attributed to the child's ASSC experiences. For a little less than half of the children, the ASSC teachers felt that the pupils should have attended the ASSC more frequently. It was judged that the vast majority of the children should attend an ASSC program again next year.

The ASSC teachers felt that in the majority of cases, there was sufficient exchange of information between the ASSC staff and the Child's regular classroom teacher. The results in this area, however, are much less clearcut than were the ratings pertaining to the Children's progress. It appears likely that it would be advisable for future ASSC programs to attempt to increase the extent of communication with the Children's regular classroom teacher.

Item No. 10 asked that the ASSC teachers "Please summarize what you believe to be the overall effects of this Child's ASSC experiences this year". Of the 99 children, rated, 13 were rated as having had a generally effective academic experience, 43 were listed as having improved in reading, 13 improved in math, 17 were rated as having gained in self-confidence, 21 as having improved in their social behavior, 18 were observed to have been helped toward better speech, 17 as having had improved work habits, 5 were referred to as having improved generally in their use of English, and 12 as having experienced an improvement in attitudes. Ten children were rated as having undergone no specific observable improvements. Of course, many children were rated by their ASSC teachers as having been helped in two or more of these areas. In general, the responses to this question further illustrate that the ASSC teachers felt that our sample of children were successfully helped by their ASSC programs and experiences.

Item No. 11 of this part of the ASSC teachers' ratings asked "In what areas (be as specific as possible) do you feel this child still needs supplementary or remedial help?" Many children were rated as being in need of more than one area of help, of course, 37 children were listed as needing help in reading, 17 in math, 15 in English, 11 in comprehension, 10 in speech, 9 in all academic areas, 6 in vocabulary, 4 in personality development, 3 need individual attention and support, 2 in work habits, and 1 in increasing his speed of work. Nineteen of the children were rated as not needing any specific remediation or supplementary help. Judging from this list of needs, in comparison to the areas of help given in Item No. 10, these results further support the observation that the ASSC teachers felt that their programs were well suited to their pupils' needs.

B. The Pupils as Rated by their Regular Class Teachers

For 97 out of the 99 children in our sample, their regular classroom teachers completed the "Regular Teacher Interview Form" reproduced above in Figure 1. Two teachers proved uncooperative when asked to complete the form.

The initial section of this interview from, referred to as "Part A. Information Received by Regular Teacher From ASSC", shall be dealt with first. Items 1-8 required only a "Yes" or "No" answer. The item contents and number of children whose teachers responded "Yes" follow:

Item	Content	Number of "Yes" Responses out of Total of 97 Children Rated
1	Have you received information concerning this child from the ASSC?	39
2	Has this information proved valuable?	23
3	Have you received any written reports from this Child's ASSC teacher?	16
4	Have you had any other contacts with this Child's ASSC teacher?	44
5	Has this child given you any information concerning his ASSC experience?	37
6	Have you received any information from this Child's parents concerning his ASSC experience?	11
7	Have you had enough feed back concerning this Child's ASSC experiences?	33
8	Would you like to have had more of such information?	63

The regular teachers reported receiving information from the ASSC on 39 out of the 97 children rated. Since in a dozen or so of the cases, the Child's ASSC teacher was also his regular class teacher, this suggests that, in almost half of the cases, no information was received from the ASSC by the Child's regular teacher.

In only about one-forth of the cases did the children's regular teachers regard the information received from the ASSC as proving valuable.

The regular teachers of only 16 out of the 97 children received written reports from the ASSC. In 44 cases out of the total, the regular teacher reported having had some other contact with the Child's ASSC teacher.

In about half of the cases where the Child had an ASSC teacher who was someone other than his regular teacher, the regular teachers reported that they were given some information from the Child concerning his ASSC experiences.

The regular teachers reported having received information from the Child's parents concerning his ASSC experiences in only 11 out of the 97 cases rated.

In less than half of the cases where a Child's regular teacher was not also his ASSC teacher did his regular teacher feel that he or she had received enough feedback concerning the Child's ASSC experiences.

In 63 out of the 97 cases, the Child's regular teacher indicated that he or she would have liked more information concerning the Children's ASSC experiences.

Item 9 of this section of the questionnaire asked, "What kinds of information would you like to receive?" Most of the responses fell into one or more of the following categories:

(a) reports of what skills are taught in the ASSC
(b) descriptions of the curriculum and materials employed in the ASSC
(c) diagnostic reports concerning the Child's areas of weaknesses and strengths.
(d) specific progress reports

"Section B." of the "Regular Teacher Interview Form" (reproduced above in Figure 1) dealt with the "Regular Teacher's Impressions Concerning the Results of this Child's ASSC Experience". Items 1-7 required only a "Yes" or "No" answer. The item contents and number of Children whose teachers responded "Yes" follow:

Item No.	Content	Number of "Yes" responses out of total of 97 Children rated
1.	Has this child been helped significantly by his ASSC experience?	49
2.	Has he been helped as much as you had expected?	49
3.	Would you have liked him to have attended the ASSC more often?	18
4.	Has he been given the kind of help he needed most?	46
5.	Have his ASSC experiences helped him to deal more effectively with the regular school day's work?	58
6.	Has he progressed more this year than comparable students who did not attend ASSC?	35
7.	Have you observed any negative effects resulting from this Child's ASSC experiences.	3

Slightly more than half of the Children were rated as having been helped significantly by their ASSC experience. An equal number were judged to have been helped as much as had been expected by their regular teachers.

Less than twenty percent of the Children were rated as needing to attend the ASSC more often than they did.

Slightly less than half of the Children were rated by their regular teachers as having been given the kind of help they needed most.

About sixty percent of the Children were judged to have been helped by their ASSC experiences to deal more effectively with their regular school day's work. This seems to be the strongest evidence supporting the conclusion that the regular teachers found the ASSC experiences worthwhile for their pupils.

The regular teachers indicated that about 36 percent of the Children had made more progress this year than did comparable students who did not attend the ASSC.

In only 3 cases was it judged that negative effects resulted from the Children's ASSC experiences. All three of these ratings were submitted by the same regular teacher who reported that the Children cried when sent to the ASSC. Since no other regular or ASSC teacher observed such a phenomenon, it appears likely that something idiosyncratic was at work involving that particular teacher.

In general, the regular teachers tended to corroborate the ASSC teacher's belief that the ASSC had beneficial effects on the children.

Item #8 of this section of the Regular Teacher Interview Form asked, "Please describe what effects this child's ASSC experiences have had on him." In eleven of the 97 cases, the regular teacher was unable to specify any observable effects. For the remaining children, a wide range of effects were attributed to their ASSC experiences. Most of these fell into one or more of the following categories:

(a) improved reading
(b) vocabulary growth
(c) increased self-confidence
(d) improved, more enthusiastic, attitudes towards school
(e) better in math

C. A Comparison of the 1969 and 1970 Teacher Evaluations (Report Card Grades) and Standardized Achievement Test Scores of the Sample of Children Attending the ASSC's

The following analyses were based on the 88 Children whose records were available for our staff to complete the School Records Data Sheet reproduced above in Figure 3.

On the average these students had attended 130 hours of the ASSC program. Of this sub sample 68% had attended between 98 and 160 hours of the after school program.

Possible differences between schools were controlled through the sampling process in addition to the sex, grade level, and absenteeism of the students.

Eighteen (18) of these students were identified as using English as a second language. Because of the fact that many were new to the New York City schools thus having no records prior to 1969-70, and because standardized test data was frequently missing and if available impossible to interpret data on these students as were not included in the major statistical phase of the study. Findings for that group are reported separately in this chapter.

Also subjected to separate analysis was data from first and second grade students who had no standard test data from the school year 1968-69. Special treatment was also given to data from two students who were the victims of lost cumulative folders.

Variables of the Study

A. Teacher evaluation 1968-69, 1969-70.
These measures were obtained from school records and included:

1. Social behavior
2. Work and study habits
3. Reading
4. Oral expression
5. Written expression
6. Spelling
7. Handwriting
8. Social studies
9. Arithmetic
10. Science
11. Health education
12. Music
13. Art

B. Standardized Academic Achievement 1968-69, 1969-70
These measures were obtained from records and included:

1. Average arithmetic
2. Reading comprehension
3. Reading vocabulary
4. Average reading

C. Attendance in Regular School Program 1968-69, 1969-70

D. Attendance in After School Study Center Program 1968-69, 1969-70.

E. Sex

F. Age

G. Grade

H. Status of Student in ASSC Program at year's end (e.g. dropped out)

Treatment of Missing Observations

The major statistical analysis was conducted on 64 of the 68 students in the sub sample for reasons indicated previously. But for 37 of these 64 students (59%) one or more pieces of information was unavailable. The most frequently encountered missing observation was a standard arithmetic score for the 1968-69 school year or a subject grade (teacher evaluation) from that year.

In dealing with the problem several methods have been used of which four are the most commonly accepted. The first method is to develop regression equations to predict missing scores on the basis of available scores. When ten or more variables are subject to analysis, however, this method becomes impractical because of the numerous combinations of missing and available data, each requiring a separate regression equation. The second involves assigning the mean value calculated on the basis of the available data pool. The effect of this is to reduce the variance of a variable. A third procedure is to sample at random from the data pool (e.g. 1969 math scores) and assign on that basis. In this case neither the mean nor the variance is typically affected beyond sampling error. The fourth method, conservative when applied to change data, is to consider the missing data "no change." For example, if the subject were to receive a spelling grade of 3 in 1969 and no 1970 grade was available, he would be assigned a score of 3, no change.

In this study the fourth method was used in the case of grades. If a grade was missing for a particular subject in either the 1969 or 1970 data his grade from the other year was assigned, if available. If neither the 1969 nor the 1970 grade was available he was assigned a score based on his average performance in similar subjects for that year. When a standard reading or arithmetic score was missing the mean score of the data pool for that grade level was assigned.

To serve as a check against possible systematic biases introduced through the missing data procedures a missing data vector was scored for each subject, 1 if a score was missing, 0 if complete data.

Table 1 shows the point-biserial correlations between the variables analyzed in the study and the missing data vector.

Table 1. Product-moment correlations between ASSC variables and missing data variable.

	missing data variables	N=64
	1969	1970
1. Social Behavior	-.08	.03
2. Work and study habits	-.06	.01
3. Reading	-.05	-.07
4. Oral expression	.04	.03
5. Written expression	-.02	-.05
6. Spelling	-.08	-.06
7. Handwriting	.02	.08
8. Social studies	-.10	.00
9. Math	-.05	.04
10. Science	-.07	.05
11. Health education	.08	.02
12. Music	.02	.06
13. Art	.11	-.04
14. Standard arithmetic	.03	-.08
15. Standard reading comprehension	-.04	-.05
16. Standard reading vocabulary	.01	.03
17. Average reading	-.02	-.01

*None of the correlations were significant at the .05 level

No systematic biasing effect was noted since none of the correlations are statistically significant at the .05 level. Stated differently, in those cases where missing data was replaced, scores were neither consistently higher nor lower than scores for subjects where all data were complete.

Sample Statistics

The sub sample selected for this portion of the study showed an average age in September, 1969 of 9.1 years (110.98 months) with a standard deviation of 14.6 months. Approximately 95% of the students were between 8 years and two months and 11 years and nine months of age at the beginning of the 1969-70 school year. Average current grade enrollment was 3.8 with a standard deviation of 1.04 indicating that only about five per cent of the ASSC students were not enrolled in grades two through six.

Despite a rather high rate of absence, only 3 subjects were identified as having dropped out of the ASSC program altogether while remaining in the regular school program.

Members of this sub sample were in attendance at centers which provided an average of 5.4 hours per week of after school activity. As one might anticipate, since no sanctions were applied relating to attendance, absence rates were higher than was the case for the regular school program. The average absence rate from the ASSC programs was 16 days per child among those in the sample, while 1969-70 regular school absences were, on the average, 10 days per child. Equating differences between the regular school program and ASSC program in the number of days per week available, the absence rates were four times as high for the ASSC programs.

1968-1969 (Pre-center) Performance

A. Teacher Evaluation

Table 2 shows 1968-69 means and standard deviations in teacher evaluations for school subjects rated on a scale of : 4= 85 & Higher; 3= 75-84; 2= 65-74; 1= Less than 65.

Table2. Means and standard deviations of teacher evaluations for ASSC students in 1968-69 (prior to ASSC program)

School Subject	$\bar{X}$	SD
1. Social behavior	2.81	.81
2. Work and study habits	2.69	.92
3. Reading	2.56	.77
4. Oral expression	2.70	.68
5. Written expression	2.56	.70
6. Spelling	2.67	.73
7. Handwriting	2.65	.77
8. Social studies	2.56	.58
9. Math	2.57	.61
10. Science	2.64	.57
11. Health education	2.76	.42
12. Music	2.81	.43
13. Art	2.84	.51

B. Standard Achievement Data (1968-69)

Table 3 shows means and standard deviations of grade equivalent (unadjusted) scores in arithmethic and reading. These data were

derived primarily from the Metropolitan Achievement Test, but in a few instances either the Iowa Test of Basic Skills or the New York State Test was used.

Table 3. Means and standard deviations of standard grade equivalents on Arithmetic and Reading 1968-69.

Test	$\bar{X}$	SD
Average Arithmetic	3.33	.86
Reading Comprehension	3.21	1.04
Reading Vocabulary	3.06	.99
Average Reading	3.15	.98

The best scores from the Spring of 1969 indicate the ASSC students were typically six to nine months behind in reading and arithmetic according to their grade placement at that time. Although slightly below average, the students did not appear to be in serious academic difficulty prior to entering the ASSC program.

1969-1970 Performance (ASSC Program in effect)

A. Teacher Evaluations

Table 4 presents 1969-70 means and standard deviations in teacher evaluations for school subjects and change between 1969 and 1970 rated on a scale of: 4= 85 & Higher; 3= 75-84; 2= 65-74; 1= Less than 65.

Table 4. Means, standard deviations, and change in teacher evaluations for ASSC students, 1969-70 (subseuqent to ASSC program)

School Subject	$\bar{X}$	SD	average change from 1969
1. social behavior	2.76	.90	-.05
2. work and study habits	2.86	.85	.17
3. reading	2.70	.78	.14
4. oral expression	2.83	.76	.13
5. written expression	2.55	.64	-.02
6. spelling	2.75	.79	.08
7. handwriting	2.65	.75	.00
8. social studies	2.61	.72	.05
9. math	2.64	.69	.06
10. science	2.66	.67	.02

The data on teacher evaluation indicate very little change in the status of their students relative to others as perceived by their teachers. The larger raw differences were in the areas of work and study habits (2.69 to 2.86), reading (2.56 to 2.70) and oral expression (2.70 to 2.83).

To determine whether any of the changes in teacher evaluations were large enough to consider statistically significant, F values based on regression equations taking into account the correlated nature of the 1969 and 1970 teacher evaluations were calculated. Table 5 shows their F values (t^2) and indicates the probability of obtaining values of that magnitude through random fluctuations due to sampling (p).

Table 5. F values (t^2) and probability levels for changes in teacher evaluations.

School Subject	F	p
1. social behavior	.09	.78
2. work and study habits	1.20	.28
3. reading	1.03	.31
4. oral expression	.73	.39
5. written expression	.00	.99
6. spelling	.65	.45
7. handwriting	.00	.99
8. social studies	.16	.69
9. math	.02	.89
10. science	.00	.99

It can be seen from the above data that none of the changes in teacher evaluation between 1969 and 1970 were sufficiently large to consider a result of factors other than sampling error.

B. Standard Achievement Data (1969-70)

Continued in Table 6 are arithmetic and reading grade equivalent (unadjusted) means and standard deviations as well as raw changes in grade equivalents from 1969 to 1970.

Table 6. Means, standard deviations,and changes in grade equivalent scores for ASSC students, 1969-70 (subsequent to ASSC program).

Test	$\bar{X}$	SD	average change from June 1969 to June 1970
Average Arithmetic	4.15	.92	.82
Reading Comprehension	4.02	1.22	.81
Reading Vocabulary	4.05	1.47	.98
Average Reading	4.06	1.25	.91

The standard achievement data in Table 6 indicate that the ASSC students improved from nine months in average arithmetic to approximately one year-five months in reading vocabulary. Since nearly all of the subjects had complete data in reading, and since reading showed more than a year's growth, the arithmetic change is considered a conservative figure due to the fact that the most frequent type of missing data was 1969 arithmetic. As was previously noted, the mean score from the appropriate data pool was inserted in the absence of a standard test score, thus serving to reduce the variance.

To determine if any of the changes in reading or arithmetic standard achievement were statistically significant, F values based on regression equations taking into account the correlated nature of the 1969 and 1970 achievement scores were calculated. Table 7 shows the F values (t^2) and indicated the probability of attaining values of that magnitude through random fluctuations due to sampling (p).

Table 7. F values (t^2) and probability levels for changes in standard achievement.

School Subject	F	p
Average Arithmetic	26.52	.00000
Reading Comprehension	15.93	.00011
Reading Vocabulary	17.45	.00005
Average Reading	16.81	.00008

The data in Table 6 and 7 suggests that changes among the ASSC group in standard achievement were statistically significant and further more, substantial in a practical sense.

Correlates of 1970 Performance

As was indicated above, students in the ASSC program improved significantly in standard arithmetic and reading achievement. On the other hand, their evaluations by teachers based on comparis ons with other students functioning in the same classroom did not improve. In view of this, the purpose of the following section is to identify variables that were associated with positive changes in reading and arithmetic standard achievement.

As one might anticipate positive changes in standard academic achievement were associated with better 1969-1970 attendance in the regular school program: Reading comprehension, r=.29; reading vocabulary, r=.25; average reading, r=.34. These correlations were significant at the .05 level.

However, only in the case of average student reading was attendance at the ASSC program associated with positive change in achievement between 1969 and 1970, r=.25.

Children with lower 1969 standard achievement scores tended to make more use of the ASSC program as measured by attendance: 1969 standard arithmetic r=.40; 1969 standard reading comprehension r=.30 1969 standard reading vocabulary r=.25; 1969 standard average reading =.28.

The sex of the student was not associated with attendance at the After School S$_t$udy Centers, and was only associated with positive change in standard arithmetic achievement (r=.30), males favored.

Grade level and chronological age were not associated with changes in any of the standard achievement variables. This finding is unusual because it is typically found that younger children in lower grades exhibit relatively larger increases in achievement.

Positive changes in work-study habits were significantly associated with specific changes in: 1) social behavior, r=.49; 2) reading, r=27; 3) spelling, r=.34; 4) arithmetic standard achievement, r=.27; 5) standard reading comprehension, r=.30; 6) average standard reading, r=.26.

ATTENDANCE

In 1968-1969, the students were absent an average of 11.97 days with a standard deviation of 14.13; very great individual differences in attendance. In 1969-1970, these same students, now in the After School Study Center programs decreased in average number of days absent to 9.83 with a standard deviation of 9.45; a lessening of individual differences in attendance.

DROP-OUTS

Since only 3% of the sample were identified as having dropped out of the After School Study Center program while remaining in school, the statistical analysis of this variable was not feasible.

ENGLISH-AS-A-SECOND-LANGUAGE STUDENTS

A. Ethnic Distribution
   Eighteen students in the sample of 88 were identified as using English as a second language. This represents about 20 per cent of the sample, a substantial number. These students were of five different ethnicities, and were distributed as follows: Chinese, N=5; Puerto Rican, N=5, Italian, N=5; French, N=1, and Greek, N=1.

B. Grade Level

Table 7. Grade level distribution of English-as-a Second-Language After School Study Center students

	GRADE					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
N	0	4	9	3	2	0

C. Attendance

Average absences from the After School Study Center program for the English-as-a-Second-Language students number 5½. This is in comparison to an absence rate of 16 days on the average for the 66 students who were English speaking.

D. Teacher Evaluations - 1969-1970

In the case of the English-as-a-Second-Language students, it was not feasible to analyze 1968-1969 data because in only a few cases were complete data available. Seven of the students were not in the United States in the year prior to the After School Study Center program.

Table 8. Average 1969-1970 Teacher Evaluations for English-as-a-Second-Language Students

Subject	$\bar{X}$	N (data available)
Social Behavior	3.00	17
Work & Study Habits	2.94	17
Reading	2.68	16
Oral Expression	2.46	14
Written Expression	2.23	13
Spelling	2.33	15
Handwriting	2.72	18
Social Studies	2.53	15
Arithmetic	2.47	17
Science	2.46	15
Health	2.78	14
Music	2.92	13
Art	3.07	13

Although no statistical tests were conducted, the average teacher evaluations for the English-as-a-Second-Language students appear consistent with the language limitations.

For social behavior and work study habits, teacher evaluations tend to be higher than was the case for the regular students, (see tables 8 and 4). Teacher evaluations in the subject areas, however, are lower for the English-as-a-second-Language Students.

Seven of the 18 English-as-a-Second-Lanaguage students obtained teacher evaluation averages of 3.00 or above (3=good); nine of the 18 obtained teacher evaluation averages of 2.00 to 2.99 (2=fair); and two of the 18 obtained teacher evaluation averages of less than 2.00.

E. Standardized Achievement Scores 1969-1970
An analysis of standard reading (average) and standard arithmetic (average) achievement was conducted to determine the proportions of students achieving above, at, and below grade level. Table 9 shows the results of this analysis.

Table 9. Frequency and Proportions of English-as-a-Second-Language Students achieving above, at, or below grade level on standard achievement tests.

Student Status	Arithmetic (	Arithmetic %	Reading (	Reading %
Above grade level	5	28	2	10
Within four months of grade level	2	10	0	0
5-9 months behind grade level	1	06	1	06
1 grade or more behind	3	16	0	0
2 grades or more behind	2	10	1	06
No scores	5	28	14	77

Special Cases in the Sample

Student number 17 was a female whose cumulative folder was missing. She attended only seven sessions of the After School Study Center program and was absent from the regular classroom on 15 occasions during the 1969-1970 school year.

It was indicated that she was a "guidance case" showing unsatisfactory evaluations by the teacher in social behavior, work and study habits, spelling, and arithmetic.

Evaluations in other academic subjects were "fair" except for oral expression, which was rated "good". Her standardized reading scores were as follows: Comprehension, 3.4; Vocabulary, 3.9; average reading, 3.7.

Student number 84 was another female whose cumulative folder was missing. She was absent from the After School Study Center program on only two occassions, the program being available in her school three days a week. No absences were noted during the course of the regular school program. Teacher evaluations in every subject area were "4" (excellent) and her average standard reading grade equivalent was 3.2. She was in the second grade.

Of the remaining three students of the original 88 in the sample, two were second graders and one was enrolled in the first grade. First graders were not given standard achievement tests. Although his record indicated perfect attendance in the regular school program, he was absent from After School Study Center which operated 3 days a week on 27 occasions.

All teacher evaluation scores for this child were "3" (good).

Both of the second graders showed perfect attendance records for the regular school program and were absent two and three days respectively, from the After School Study Center program. Standard reading test scores indicated one of the student's average reading to be 3.3, and the other 2.2. The child earning the lower standard reading score received the teacher evaluations of "2" (fair" in all of the language arts subjects and "3" (good) in other academic areas. For the child whose standard scores were above grade level, teacher evaluations were "4" in the language arts; "3" in other academic subjects.

In summary, these quantitative analyses indicated that the teacher evaluations (report card grades) of the 88 children in this subsample did not change significantly between 1969 (before the students were enrolled in this years ASSC's) and 1970 (following this year's ASSC experiences). This finding is surprising since, in the qualitative reports of the ASSC teachers and regular teachers of our full sample of 97 children, as reported above in Sections A and B of these results, the children were judged to have been helped substantially by their ASSC experiences.

The quantitative analyses of the 1969 and 1970 standardized achievement test scores of the 88 children in this subsample, however, did support the teachers' observations of significant improvement resulting from the ASSC experiences. The children were found to have undergone statistically significant improvement in Average Arithmetic, Reading Comprehension, Reading Vocabulary, and Average Reading.

D. The ASSC Staff's Overall Evaluations of their ASSC's

The following qualitative analyses are based on the reports of the 47 ASSC staff members, drawn from 15 different ASSC's in all five boroughs, as obtained from their responses to the "A. General Interview" section of the "Staff and Administrator Interview Form".

Question 1 asked, "What do you think are the best features of your ASSC?". The most frequent responses, and the number of staff members expressing such judgments, were:

	Response Category	Frequency
1.	Smaller classes and individualized instruction.	34
2.	A special, informal, interpersonally close, supportive atmosphere.	11
3.	Provides a supervised, quiet place to study after school.	7

Response Category	Frequency
4. Voluntary attendance makes for good motivation.	5

If the ASSC staff's views are correct, then the major impact of the center experiences may be in the area of changing students' attitudes towards school, teachers, and themselves as worthwhile, individualistic learners. Such changes, it would appear, would involve deep and significant feelings that would color a students' future educational stance, perhaps over a lifetime. The impact of such experiences would be long-range ones and would not be expected to produce quick results that could be demonstrated by the last working period of the same year the programs were carried out. The full benefits of such changes, would probably not be felt immediately but, would show up in the form of extra scholastic and personal growth over the years to come. Re-evaluation of our sample, in comparison to matched non-ASSC-attenders, a few years from now, would thus appear to be a worthwhile undertaking.

Question 2. asked, "What do you think are the major limitations of your ASSC?" The most frequent responses to this item can be summarized as follows:

Response Category	Frequency
1. Lack of materials and supplies especially those of a stimulating and different nature.	21
2. Attendance should be mandatory instead of voluntary, with parental approval, especially for children in need of remediation	15
3. Children are too tired after the regular school day to profit fully from the late hour session.	15
4. More teachers are needed so that more children can be seen in smaller classes.	9

Many of the remaining responses to this question concerning the major limitations of the ASSC's dealt with the need for more lesson time, more frequent sessions, more time for preparation, staffing, and meetings with parents and the children's regular teachers.

In Brief, most of these limitations appear surmountable were there more money spent on the programs and were the programs conducted within the regular, and hence, compulsory, school hours.

Question 3. asked, "To What extent do Students seek and receive assistance at your ASSC? Please elaborate."

The overwhelming majority of the 47 respondents felt that children actively seek help and receive such help at the ASSC's. The most frequent answers were of the following types:

Response Category	Frequency
1. The children come voluntarily, enjoy being at the ASSC, and request help for specific problems which they cannot get elsewhere.	29
2. Attendance is good, indicating concern of parents, regular teachers, and the child himself.	14
3. The good motivation and voluntary attendance selects on the type of students who profit most. Those who need help most, but are poorly motivated, do not enroll, or drop out, or create behavior problems.	5

It is clear therefore, that the ASSC staff members felt that the programs readily offered needed assistance to those children who attended but raised the possibility that those pupils who need help the most simply do not attend. This would be in keeping with the finding reported above in Section C. of the results that, although slightly below average, the sample of students did not appear to be in serious academic difficulty prior to entering the ASSC program.

Item 4. asked, "What suggestions do you have for improving the ASSC?" Answers to this question paralleled those given to the second item which dealt with the major limitations of the ASSC programs. The most frequent types of answers were:

Response Category	Frequency
1. Better and more materials, provided as early as possible in the program, especially those not used in the regular school day programs.	22

Response Category	Frequency
2. More teachers, teachers aides, smaller, more homogeneous classes.	16
3. Way of improving attendance and decreasing pupil turnover.	9
4. Snacks and recesses to maintain high motiviation	9

Other suggestions including split-shift teaching so that the 3-5 PM programs would be carried out by less tired teachers, greater correlation between ASSC and regular day's teaching, greater supervision and clearer guidelines for the ASSC staff, more physical activities in a club-like atmosphere for the children.

Question 5. asked the ASSC staff members, "What do you think of the Procedure's employed in selecting which children will attend the ASSC?" 32 out of the 47 staff interviewed found the present selection procedures very satisfactory. Most of the remaining comments offered such points as the need for greater staff size since, currently, discipline-problem children cannot be maintained, the need for greater pressure to be exerted on parents to send their children, this need for more selective invitations to the program, since it is needed most by many children who never show up. Surprisingly, 3 of the 47 staff members claimed to have no idea of how children are selected for the program. This obviously suggests a need for increased communication among supervisors and teachers concerning the purposes and structure of the ASSC.

Question 6. asked, "What do you think about the attendance problems of the ASSC? Twenty-five of the 47 respondents felt that there were no significant attendance problems. Most of the remaining answers expressed the belief that the reasons for less than maximum attendance lie in the fact that attendance is voluntary (and it should remain so), that weather conditions often interfere, and that children are understandably tired and less than optimally motivated after a long school day. Only 5 of the 47 respondents seemed to view the ASSC attendance problems as substantial ones in need of special attention.

In general, the responses to these six items suggested that the ASSC staff members are, by and large, quite favorable in their attitudes towards their programs. They seem to feel that the programs work well but, of course, could be improved. The staff seem to feel that they are doing a good job, that children are being helped substantially, and seemed almost entirely without complaints concerning their own working conditions in the centers.

E. The Regular Teachers' Overall Evaluations of the ASSC's.

The regular classroom teachers of 97 out of the 99 children in our total sample responded to requests that they generally evaluate the ASSC's. They were asked to answer four such questions, which were contained in Items 10-13 of section A. of the "Regular Teacher Interview Form".

Item 10. asked, "What do you think are the best features of the ASSC?" The vast majority of responses referred to small class size, individualized attention, the availability of specific help for specific problems, the opportunity for the child to practice skills only briefly introduced in class, enrichment experiences not readily available in regular class, focussed remediation, and a freer atmosphere conducive to the improvement of self-confidence and school attitudes. These responses are impressively similar to those obtained when the ASSC staff members were asked the same question, as reported above. Interestingly, however, was the absence of regular teachers' responses dealing with the advantages offered by the voluntary attendance feature of the ASSC. It might be hypothesized that a regular classroom teacher is not very comfortable acknowledging the fact that many of his or her pupils simply would not be in class were attendance not mandatory! What the regular teachers are clearly comfortable with, however, is the fact that they cannot offer their relatively large classes the opportunity for individually tailored intensive education and are pleased to have their students offered this in an after school setting.

Item 11. asked, "What do you think are the major limitations of the ASSC?" Here, too, the regular teachers' appraisal perfectly mirrored that of the ASSC staff. The major limitations of the ASSC as they saw them were:

(a) not enough new and different materials are employed
(b) not enough teachers are available to provide very small, homogenously grouped, classes.
(c) the children are too tired and the hour is too late for the pupils to be maximally receptive.
(d) the children who need the most help are often the ones who do not attend.

Item 12. asked the regular teachers, "To what extent do students seek and receive assistance at the ASSC? Responses to this question, possibly because it was too vaguely phrased, were widely varied and difficult to categorize. Most, however, suggested the belief that children who attend the ASSC feel free enough to request specific help and are given it by the ASSC staff. Many also suggested that, since the children seem to be improving in their basic educational tool skills, they must enjoy the growth experiences provided.

Item 13. asked,"What suggestions do you have for improving the ASSC"? Responses to this question followed logically from the answers given to the foregoing questions pertaining to the regular teachers' perceptions of the strengths and weaknesses of the center programs. Furthermore, their answers closely paralleled those obtained when the ASSC responded to the same question. Most of the regular teachers' suggestions involved the need for smaller, more homogeneously grouped, classes, more stimulating and enriching materials, better communication between regular teachers and ASSC staff, and ways of maintaining high attendance and reduced pupil turnover.

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Six sources supplied the data upon which to base our conclusions and recommendations. These were (1) interim observations of seven ASSC's, including interviews with a small number of randomly selected children, (2) ASSC - teacher - ratings of 99 children attending 15 ASSC's, (3) Regular classroom teacher ratings of 97 of these same children, (4) Overall evaluations of the ASSC's by these children's regular classroom teachers, (5) Overall evaluations of the ASSC's by 47 Center staff members, and (6) Quantitative comparisons of the 1969 and 1970 report card grades, standardized test scores, and attendance figures of 88 out of these same 99 children.

Such a complex, and occasionally contradictory, array of data makes it difficult, if not impossible, to succintly summarize the results or to generate a set of clearly formulated or unambiguously supported conclusions and recommendations.

In general, however, the opinion of the Teaching and Learning evaluation team, concerning the New York City 1969-1970 After School Study Centers programs is that, like the title of an earlier monograph, It Works: (After-School Study Centers, New York City, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare).

Let us now turn to some issues concerning how it works, how well it works, for whom it works, in what areas it works least well, and how it might work better.

MAJOR CONCLUSIONS

Both the ASSC teachers and the regular teachers of the majority of our sample of children expressed the belief that the ASSC experiences

helped the pupils significantly and in the areas in which they most needed help. Help was given in all basic educational tool skills, in communication (especially for the non-English speaking), in increasing self-confidence, and in improving attitudes towards school and towards oneself as a capable, worthwhile learner. The children were also frequently judged to have improved scholastically moreso than similar pupils who did not attend an ASSC this year.

Quantitative evidence of improved achievement on the par of the ASSC pupils was obtained through comparison of the 1969 and 1970 standardized achievement test socres of our sample of children. Their 1970 scores were statistically significantly higher than those of 1969 on measures of Average Arithmetic, Reading Comprehension, Reading Vocabulary, and Average Reading.

Report card grades, however, did not reflect any substantial changes between 1969 and 1970, despite the fact that the same teachers who gave these report card grades rated the children as having been helped substantially by their ASSC experiences. The teacher's qualitative comments suggested that the impact of the ASSC's on the pupil's attitudes and work skills may be of a quite long-range nature and produce report card grade improvements in subsequent years. Re-evaluation of these children in a few years time would be necessary, of course, to confirm such an hypothesis.

What factors operate to make the ASSC's work? The major reasons for their successful operation, in the opinion of both the regular teachers and the ASSC staff, were small classes and individualized instruction, a special, informal, interpersonally close, supportive atmosphere, the provision of a supervised, quiet place to study after school, good motivation associated with voluntary attendance, focussed remediation, and the opportunity to practice skills and gain enrichment not available during the regular school day.

What were the major limitations of the ASSC programs? Regular teachers and ASSC staff judged these to be a lack of materials and supplies, especially those of a stimulating nature unavailable in the regular classroom, sporadic attendance, pupil turnover, a tendency for many students who need the program most to never attend or to attend rarely, the late hour of the program is such that the pupils tend to be tired and less than optionally receptive, the need for more staff so that more children can be offered smaller, more homogeneously grouped classes. The regular teachers also reported as a major limitation the lack of diagnostic and progress reports concerning their pupils from the ASSC staff.

The Teaching and Learning evaluation team shares these views of the strengths and weaknesses of the ASSC programs. We would add,

however, a few of our own comments. While voluntary attendance and lack of supplies do impose restrictions on the programs, we have observed some ASSC staff members who have taken in on their own to overcome these obstacles. They gathered their own imaginative and novel materials, employed games and interest-inspiring techniques such as puzzles, dramatic productions, and special-interest, club-like class groupings. Some of these and other teachers also went out of their way to see to it that attendnace was kept up. They arranged meetings with parents, contacted parents regularly when children were absent, etc. It seems quite possible that all ASSC teachers, given appropriate direction and support by their ASSC supervisors, could employ such maneuvers with very desirable effects.

RECOMMENDATIONS

When our sample of ASSC staff members and regular teachers were asked how they thought the ASSC's could be improved, their responses primarily focussed in the following areas: Better and more materials, provided as early as possible in the program, especially those of a different type than are available in the regular classroom, more teachers and teacher-aides so that smaller, more homogenous, classes could be formed, a change in the ASSC structure that would improve attendance and decrease pupil turnover, and snacks and recesses to maintain and foster high pupil motivation. Other suggestions included split-shift teaching arrangements so that the 3-5 PM programs would be staffed by less tired teachers, greater coordination and information interchange between the ASSC staff and the children's regular teachers, greater supervision and clearer guidelines for the ASSC staff, and more physical activities in a club-like atmosphere for the children.

It is unhesitatingly recommended by the Teaching and Learning evaluation team that the ASSC programs be continued in the coming years. We share all of the recommendations made by the ASSC staff and regular teachers.

We would add a few specific recommendations of our own, however.

It is well known among educational program directors that one can rather easily follow the "success route" and amass impressive results by selecting and maintaining only those enrollees who will most readily adapt to and profit from your educational programs current structure. In that way, the status quo can be complacently maintained, and since those pupils who would "rock the boat" are excluded, innovations designed to attract and help the needy but recalcitrant student can be comfortably avoided. We believe this is largely what the ASSC's have done, perhaps unintentionally, perhaps not. That is, we believe that the ASSC's have rather successfully completed their mission as far as those children who attend regularly

are concerned. What is disquieting, however, is what they are not doing for those children who are greatly in need of after school remediation and enrichment but who, for a variety of reasons, never attend the centers or are excluded from them because of their misbehavior, uncooperativeness, etc. Are such students to be shrugged off just because they "don't fit" into the present After School Study Center framework, are they going to be permitted to end up as drop-outs? We urge the After School Study Programs in the future to make a maximal effort at reaching these children. If need be, monetary, staff and other limitations being what they are, such students should be given top priority and perhaps necessarily, though regrettably, displace many of the less impaired but better motivated students who currently attend. A variety of techniques ought to be tried in an attempt to reach the thusfar unreachable potential After School Study Center enrollee. Mandatory attendance, monetary and other material and social incentives for such children and their parents, more attractive working conditions for such After School Study Center staff who elect to have such pupils in their classes, etc. are the types of maneuvers that seem worthy of a trial. Once in attendance at the After School Study Centers, these students will not remain, of course, unless the center staffs continuously reach out to them, demonstrate their positive regard for them, and offer them a stimulating and relevant educational and social experience.

AFTER SCHOOL STUDY CENTERS

EVALUATION STAFF

Evaluation Director:	Fredric Nalven
Associate Director:	Louis J. Hofmann
Evaluation Assistants:	Hennie Durst Betty Nork Patricia Paone Susan Rosenberg Marie Vogel
Evaluation Consultants:	Edsel L. Erickson Edmund W. Gordon Lee M. Joiner Alan J. Simon